

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

225

CWP No. 21724-CAT of 2014

Date of decision: 28.09.2016

Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. and Another

...petitioners

Vs.

Pardip Kumar Panigrahy and Another

...respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

Present: Mr. K.B. Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. D.R. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Vivek Arora, Advocate for respondent No. 1.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.(ORAL)

The petitioners have approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing of order dated 29.08.2014 (P-5) passed by Ld. Central Administrative Tribunal Chandigarh Bench (in short “the tribunal”).

2. Respondent No. 1 had approached the Tribunal primarily claiming that he be deputed for training course of Junior Training Officer (Telecom) (in short 'JTO') which was to commence w.e.f. 30.06.2014 .

3. Respondent No. 1, vide interim order dated 27.06.2014 (Annexure P-3) passed by the Tribunal was allowed to participate in the said training on executing an indemnity bond of ₹2,00,000/- in favour of the petitioners. The tribunal on 29.08.2014 (Annexure P-5), which has been impugned in the present petition, had disposed of the original application by permitting respondent No. 1 to be deputed for the training of JTO(T) commencing in October, 2014 without

furnishing of the indemnity bond.

4. Accordingly, this Court vide interim order dated 28.10.2014 had directed that respondent No. 1 be deputed for training. It was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that in pursuance to the said order, the respondent No. 1 had completed the training but on 29.10.2015 during the pendency of the petition, the petitioner No. 2 has inflicted the punishment of reduction in pay by one stage upon the respondent No. 1.

5. In view thereof, it was claimed that the present petition has been rendered infructuous and be disposed of as such. However, liberty be granted to the petitioners to take action against respondent No. 1 in accordance with law.

6. Ordered accordingly.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

September 28, 2016
Poonam (II)

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No